UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,617	07/07/2005	Jacques Noury	28971.0135	7808

27890 7590 01/28/2008

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
DOE, SHANTA G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1797	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,617	NOURY, JACQUES	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shanta G. Doe	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/7/2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 July 2005* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/7/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the syringe claimed in claim 6 and the pilot light claimed in claim 19 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2, 4, 7 , 10, 11, 15 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Regarding claim 4, the claim recites the limitation "the sample extraction means". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Regarding claim 7, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, the applicant claims that the plug is made of a plastic metal in claim 7 however, it is unclear to the examiner what a plastic metal is.

6. Regarding claims 2, 10 and 11, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

7. Regarding claim 15, the claim recites the limitation "the suspected biological agent". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the heating means". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3,5,7,8,10,14 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570).

Regarding claim 1, Ehrenfeld discloses a portable and autonomous biological detector enabling the presence of biological agents (species of bacterial contaminates) of the bacteria, viruses, protozoan, or toxin type to be detected in a sample, wherein it integrates into a same body: means to extract a sample (sampling means swab(15a) or 23) from the environment, be it solid, liquid or gaseous, means for the biological culture or magnification(nutrient-indicator medium) of said sample, detection means (signal generating means (luciferase / luciferin composition is used to generates signal)) inducing a reaction, said reaction being either colorimetric and visible to the naked eye thanks to a transparent viewfinder, or detectable by a separate system (see Ehrenfeld

fig. 1 , page2 lines 23- page 3 line19; page 3 lines 30 -35; page 4 lines 15 -20, line 37- page 5 line 10) .

Regarding claim 2, Ehrenfeld discloses a portable and autonomous biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the reaction is detected by a physical and/or optical system such as a laser or by infrared light, ultraviolet light or by electron beam (see page 4 line 37- page 5 line 3).

Regarding claim 3, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector (1) according to claim 1wherein the sample extraction means are of the manual or automatic type (see page 6 lines 25 – 28).

Regarding claim 5, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 wherein the sample extraction means incorporate a bio-collector (tip of the swab 1(c)) (see fig 1).

Regarding claim 7, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the sample extraction means are in the form of a plug (the shaft of the extraction mean extends through(13B) able to be screwed or nested onto the body of the biological detector and incorporating a lip (13 A) ensuring its sealing with this body, such plug being made of stainless metal or a plastic metal and provided with the instrument enabling the extraction of the samples (15A B and C) (see fig 1)

Regarding claim 8, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the culture or magnification means incorporate a culture medium contained in a breakable ampoule so as to allow the sample to be brought into contact with said culture medium (signal generating means such as nutrient-indicator media can be packaged in an ampoule)(see page 5 lines 13 – 14 and lines 24 26) .

Regarding claim 10, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the means to detect biological agents comprise biological substances such as enzymes, antibodies, proteins, cellular fragments or sequences of DNA or RNA (the signal generating means comprises a Luciferase / luciferin composition) (page 3 lines 30 - 34).

Regarding claim 14, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the detection target may be the suspected biological agent, a product of its metabolism (ATP), a molecule or its metabolites (page 3 lines 30 - 34).

Regarding claim 17, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein it constitutes packaging means for the magnified culture (the device can serve as a packaging means for the magnified culture after the sample is washed of the swab

with a nutrient media it remains in the device) enabling its subsequent analysis and use as evidence (see fig 1; page 4 and 5).

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nason (US 5,238,649).

Regarding claim 4, Nason discloses a biological detector wherein the sample extraction means are in the form of a sampling brush(see Nason fig 10 (46), col. 8 lines 38 - 41).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10 ,14,16 ,17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nason (US 5,238,649) in view of Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570).

Regarding claim 1, Nason discloses a portable and autonomous biological detector enabling the presence of biological agents (biological specimen) of the bacteria, viruses, protozoan, or toxin type to be detected in a sample, wherein it integrates into a same body: means to extract a sample (sampling means swab(12)) from the environment, be it solid, liquid or gaseous, a reagent or other fluids is contained in the upper part of the test unit (fluid which interact with the collected sample)) ,and detection means (wick element 43 which may be impregnated with a reagent or the like for providing a final test result) inducing a reaction, said reaction being either colorimetric and visible to the naked eye thanks to a transparent viewfinder, or

detectable by a separate system (see Nason abs fig 1, 10, 25 26;col. 5 lines 30 – 45; col. 6 lines 50 -55 ; col. 12 lines 50 – 61). Nason fails to specifically teach that the fluid contained in the upper part of the biological detector is a means for the biological culture or magnification of said sample. Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570) disclose a portable biological detector comprising a means to extract a sample form the environment, fluid such as a nutrient medium may be package within the detector to contact the collected sample (means for the biological culture or magnification) of said sample and detection means. In view of Ehrenfeld, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the reagent or fluid of Nason with the nutrient medium (means for biological culture or magnification of said sample) as taught by Ehrenfeld, since the substitution of one known fluid which interact with the collected sample for another would have yielded a predictable result of having a fluid within the detector which interact with the sample before detection.

Regarding claim 2, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a portable and autonomous biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the reaction is detected by a physical (visual indicator) and/or optical system such as a laser or by infrared light, ultraviolet light or by electron beam.

Regarding claim 3, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector (1) according to claim 1wherein the sample extraction means are of the manual or automatic type (see Nason col. 6 lines 51- 53).

Regarding claim 5, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 wherein the sample extraction means incorporate a bio-collector (tip of swab (22)) (see Nason fig 1).

Regarding claim 7, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the sample extraction means are in the form of a plug (plug (25) connected to the shaft (20) of the swab) able to be screwed or nested onto the body of the biological detector and incorporating a lip(24) ensuring its sealing with this body, such plug being made of stainless metal or a plastic metal and provided with the instrument enabling the extraction of the samples (see fig 2,9 and 13; col. 6 lines19 - 21).

Regarding claim 8, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the culture or magnification means incorporate a culture medium contained in a breakable ampoule so as to allow the sample to be brought into contact with said culture medium (reagent (nutrient medium as taught by the combined reference) –containing ampoule (28) may be squeezed or deformed to fracture the ampoule)(see Nason fig 5 col. 6 lines 63 – 67)) .

Regarding claim 10, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 wherein the detection means comprise a wick impregnated with a

reagent to conduct an enzymatic test . the combination as applied to claim 1 above fails to specifically disclose the device of claim 1 wherein the means to detect biological agents comprise biological substances such as enzymes, antibodies, proteins, cellular fragments or sequences of DNA or RNA. Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570) discloses a biological detector where in the means to detect the biological agent comprise biological substances such as enzymes(the signal generating means comprises a Luciferase (enzyme) / luciferin composition) . In view of Ehrenfeld, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the detection means of the combined reference comprise a biological substance such as an enzyme in order to conduct the enzymatic test of the combined reference on the collected sample and furthermore because it was known in the art at the time to have detection means comprising enzyme.

Regarding claim 14, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein the detection target may be the suspected biological agent, a product of its metabolism, a molecule or its metabolites.

Regarding claim 16, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein it is in the form of a tube incorporating means to extract the sample(swab) in the middle , at one end the means enabling the culture or magnification of said sample (ampoule with reagent or nutrient medium) and at the other end the means to detect (wick impregnated with reagent or the like for providing a

test with visual indicator result) the suspected biological agent, these means being associated with sealing means. The combination fails to disclose that the means enabling the culture or magnification of said sample is in the middle section of the detector device and that the means to extract the sample is at one of the ends of the device. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the location of the means to extract the sample from the environment and the means enabling the culture or magnification of said sample rearranged, since it has been held that rearranging part of an invention involves only routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 17, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein it constitutes packaging means(glass vial 70 or 60) for the magnified culture enabling its subsequent analysis and use as evidence (see Nason fig 14 and 18 col. 10 lines 53 -61).

Regarding claim 20, discloses a biological detector according to claim 1, wherein it comprises security means preventing it from being opened, deliberately or not, after the sample has been inserted (see col.9 lines 1 – 5).

8. Claim 12 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as Nason (US 5,238,649) in view of Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570)applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Saruta et al (US 2002/0045278).

Regarding claim 12, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 wherein the means to detect biological agent comprise a wick impregnated with a reagent or the like for providing test which result in a visual indicator, the combined reference fails to specifically disclose that support (wick) is impregnated with specific antibodies for the suspected biological agent, enabling the immuno-detection of said biological agent. Saruta et al (US 2002/0045278) discloses that it is known in the art to have a detection means comprise a strip impregnated with an antibody to analyze a biological specimen (see Saruta Para. [0008]). In view of Saruta, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention have the detection means of the combined reference be a strip/or wick impregnated with an antibody as taught by Saruta since it was well known in the art to use such detection means when analyzing biological specimen.

Regarding claim 11, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 10. The combination fails to disclose the detector of claim 1, wherein the biological substances are associated with chemical substances such as metalloids, colloids, or colorants whose reaction with an antigen enables the visualization of the detection of the suspected biological agent. Saruta et al (US 2002/0045278) discloses that it is known in the art for detection means to comprise biological substance such as enzyme or antibody which are associated with a colorant whose reaction with an antigen enables the visualization of the detection of biological agent. It would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the biological substance of the detection mean of the combined reference be associated with colorant or metalloids whose reaction with an antigen enables the visualization of the detection of the suspected biological agent by Saruta, since it was well known in the art to do so.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as Nason (US 5,238,649) in view of Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570)applied to claim 1, and further in view of Megerle (US 5,874,046).

Regarding claim 15,Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1. The combined reference fails to disclose the device of claim 1, wherein the suspected biological agent is anthrax (Bacillus anthracis) or the smallpox virus. However, Megerle (US 5,874,046) discloses that anthrax is a biological agent known in the art (see Megerle col. 1 lines 28 -39). In view of Megerle, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the biological agent of the combined reference be anthrax, since, Megerle discloses that anthrax is a biological well known in the art.

10. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570) in view of Megerle (US 5,874,046).

Regarding claim 15, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1. Ehrenfeld fails to disclose the device of claim 1, wherein the suspected biological agent is anthrax (Bacillus anthracis) or the smallpox virus. However, Megerle (US 5,874,046) discloses that anthrax is a biological agent known in the art (see Megerle col. 1 lines 28 -39). in view of Megerle, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the biological agent of Ehrenfeld be anthrax ,since, Megerle discloses that anthrax is a biological well known in the art.

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570) in view of Mehi(US 3,890,203) .

Regarding claim 6, Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 comprising a sample extraction means. Ehrenfeld fails to specifically disclose that the sample extraction means are constituted by a syringe. Mehi (US 3,890,203) discloses that it is know in the art for sample extraction means to be a syringe. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have sample extraction means of the Ehrenfeld be a syringe as taught by Mehi, since it was well known in the art at the time of the invention for a syringe to be a sample extraction means.

12. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as Nason (US 5,238,649) in view of Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570)applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Mehi(US 3,890,203).

Regarding claim 6, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 comprising a sample extraction means. The combination fails to specifically disclose that the sample extraction means are constituted by a syringe. Mehi (US 3,890,203) discloses that it is know in the art for sample extraction means to be a syringe. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have sample extraction means of the combined reference be a syringe as taught by Mehi, since it was well known in the art at the time of the invention for a syringe to be a sample extraction means.

13. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as Nason (US 5,238,649) in view of Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gordon (US 3,660,242).

Regarding claim 9, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 where in the magnification means for the sample comprise a culture chamber containing a culture or magnification medium (see Nason fig 23 and 24 (56) (30)). The combined reference fails to disclose the device of claim 1 wherein the chamber (30) is

provided with heating means. Gordon discloses that it is known in the art for culture chamber to be provided with heating means (see Gordon claim 1). In view of Gordon(US 3,660,242), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the culture chamber of the combination with a heating means as taught by Gordon in order to ensure that the culture chamber is heated to an optimal culture growth temperature.

Regarding claim 18, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1. However, the combination fails to disclose the device of claim 1 wherein it incorporates a system of power supply that supplies the heating means. Gordon discloses that it is known in the art for devices having culturing means to have a power supply system that supplies heat (electrically operated heating means)(see Gordon claim 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the culturing means of the combination with a power supply system that supplies heat as taught by Gordon in order to ensure that the culturing means is heated to an optimal culture growth temperature

14. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as Nason (US 5,238,649) in view of Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barbera-Guillem (US 2002/0072113).

Regarding claim 13, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1 comprising a culture chamber containing a culture or magnification medium (see Nason fig 23 and 24 (56) (30)). The combination fails to disclose the device of claim 1, wherein it incorporates a septum placed near the culture chamber so as to enable the extraction by syringe of said culture. Barbera-Guillem (US 2002/0072113) discloses that it known in the art for septum to be placed near a culture chamber (see Barbera-Guillem Para. [0026]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place a septum near the culture chamber of the combined reference as taught by Barbera-Guillem, since, Barbera-Guillem states that such a modification would enable substances to be introduced into or withdrawn from the chamber in a sterile manner (see Barbera-Guillem Para. [0026]).

15. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nason (US 5,238,649) in view of Ehrenfeld et al (WO96/14570) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Suntheimer et al (US 3,934,596).

Regarding claim 19, Nason in view of Ehrenfeld discloses a biological detector according to claim 1. The combination fails to disclose the device of claim 1 wherein it comprises a pilot light indicating the end of the culture or biological magnification phase and the onset of the detection phase. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the device of the combined reference to further comprise a indicator light, since it was well known in the art at the

time for devices to have an indicator light (see Suntheimer et al (US 3,934,596)) in order to signal to a uses that a desire function or optimal parameter has been accomplished. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to replace the indicator light of the combined reference with a functionally equivalent light (pilot light) known in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanta G. Doe whose telephone number is 571-270-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GSD

WALTER D. GRIFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER